Page Denied

ref DDA 82-2588

STAT

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Exemptions Proposed by DDS&T to the

NO.	DDA-82-2626
DATE	5 NOV 1982

FROM:
Harry E. Fitzwater
Deputy Director for Administration
7D24 HQs.

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
1. Deputy Director for Science & Technology 6E45 HQs				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

Ev,
I don't know where this stands now that we have the EXCOM decision relative to the future of the 1454. I elected to send it, however, to get you off my "I owe you file."

5 NOV 1982

1-2

STAT

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

DDA-82-2626

5 NOV 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Science and Technology

FROM: Harry E. Fitzwater
Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT: Exemptions Proposed by DDS&T to the ⬚   STAT

REFERENCE: A. ⬚ Policy and Procedures for   STAT
.Management of Information Handling
Systems

     B. Memo for DDA from DDS&T, dated
25 October 1982, Subject: Proposed
Exemptions to ⬚   STAT

1. We appreciate the need to conduct research in an environment that is unfettered by the management imperatives that relate to large systems development. Relevant to senior level oversight management, we are not, therefore, concerned with research projects that have a limited life. Also, unless embedded systems interface with the broader Agency IHS environment, we are not concerned with them. Consequently, I agree with the exemption of research projects and embedded systems from the same process as applied to system developments. Even though not so stated in reference A, it is our intention to operate with the understanding that these exemptions apply. The suggested insert paragraph in reference B will serve as the operational guide.

2. I would prefer to proceed in this manner because ⬚ has STAT
already been extended. The purpose of ⬚ was to provide a general STAT
format with which to initiate the oversight management process and begin to gain some experience with it. I believe that the proper next step is preparation of the HR, rather than a revised HN, and I do not believe that we have proceeded far enough at this time to draft the HR.

3. There are some further issues relevant to research or prototype systems which the IHSA will discuss with relevant DDS&T offices prior to preparation of any further guidance documents in this area. Among these are: What management procedures are relevant to prototype systems - how do we define the questions to be answered and how they are to be answered? How do we deal with prototype systems which turn out not to have a limited life. When prototypes are successful, they frequently begin to be relied upon for operational support and start growing into major systems that need to be interfaced with the broader Agency environment. Because they started as research projects, we then can have significant

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

problems integrating and supporting them in such a broader environment.
We will need your help in resolving how we should deal with these cases.

Harry E. Fitzwater

Harry E. Fitzwater

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

IHSA/DDA/ _____ |Nov 82| _____   STAT

Distribution:
  Original - Addressee
         2 - DDA
         2 - IHSA/Chrono
         1 - DDA Registry

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. EO/DDA	*(initials)*	27 OCT 1982
2. ADDA	*(initials)*	28 OCT 1982
3. DDA	*(initials)*	10/28
4. IHSA *Request your comments.*	*(initials)*	11/2
5. DDA		

Action		File		Note and Return
Approval		For Clearance		Per Conversation
As Requested		For Correction		Prepare Reply
Circulate		For Your Information		See Me
Comment		Investigate		Signature
Coordination		Justify		

REMARKS

Cc to /IHSA 28 OCT 1982 *done*

FYI:

Per _____ dtd 16 Sep 82, _____ was extended   STAT
one year until 1 Oct 83. IHSA, the initiator of
_____ was queried by RCD on 9 Jul to see if the notice   STAT
should be extended. IHSA replied in writing on 23 Jul
that a 1-year extension was desirable. It is not RCD
policy to re-coordinate for extensions of expiration
dates.

ba

1—3: Suggest you might want to discuss with DDS+T; the HN, as BA states, has already been extended.   STAT

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrent clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7–76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

☆ GPO : 1981 0 - 341-529 (120)

ref DDA 82-2583

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Exemptions Proposed by DDS&T to the

STAT

FROM: Harry E. Fitzwater Deputy Director for Administration 7D24 HQs.	NO. DDA-82-2626
	DATE 5 NOV 1982

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
1. Deputy Director for Science & Technology 6E45 HQs				Ev, I don't know where this stands now that we have the EXCOM decision relative to the future of the 1450. I elected to send it, however, to get you off my "I owe you file."
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				STAT
9.				NOV 1982
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

FORM 610 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS
1-79

2 5 OCT 1982

82-2583

DDS&T-4011-82

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

FROM: R. E. Hineman
                Deputy Director for Science and Technology

SUBJECT: Proposed Exemptions to [   ]   STAT

REFERENCE: [   ] Policy and Procedures for Management   STAT
                of Information Handling Systems

1.   The purpose of this memorandum is to reiterate certain proposed changes to the referenced Headquarters Notice. Although that notice expired on October 1, I am assuming that its reissuance is, at least, under consideration.

2.   As you know, the DS&T is heavily involved in the use of automated systems. Many of these, however, are one-of-a-kind systems, research oriented, or subsystems embedded in larger systems. The broad scope of [   ] encompasses these and, if   STAT
enforced, would place an undue burden on our project managers.

3.   I urge your consideration of the following:

     a.   Exclude from the review process systems of short expected operational life.

     b.   Exclude those systems whose basic aim is research, as opposed to the provision of information services.

Where these research projects deal with the application of new technologies to information handling problems, they are in response to coordinated and approved requirements revalidated yearly. If correctly focused they are speculative, and likely to "fail" in the sense of not leading to a follow-on system acquisition/development activity (but, of course, "succeed" in the sense of evaluating fairly the technology).

Where these projects are used only for providing a research test bed, and not for the provision of an information service to the Agency, they are already subject to a larger requirements and review process and, of course, subjected to a "proof by use" in the course of the R&D activity to which they are subordinated (see also, the proposed embedded system exclusion below).

c. Exclude those systems which are embedded in a larger system and which do not, of themselves, provide an information service to the Agency.

Principles which guide the review and evaluation of the larger "parent" system should apply. Such embedded systems, which do not have a separate existence, should not be burdened with two sets of objectives which are engendered by two independent review procedures.

Of course, if the larger "parent system" is itself qualified for such review, then it must abide by the applicable policies.

4. Therefore, I suggest that any reissuance of [ ] include the following exemption: STAT

"ADP equipment or software is exempt from the requirements stated herein if built or modified to special government specifications which have little or no general purpose applicability and are integral to, embedded in, and have an expected operational life of short duration. Included also in this exemption are ADP equipment or software whose basic aim is solely to provide a research test bed."

5. I suggest these recommendations be favorably considered and would be happy to discuss these issues further if that is desired.   STAT

R. E. Hineman

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

<u>This Notice Expires 1 October 1983</u>

MANAGEMENT

STAT

7 April 1982

POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR MANAGEMENT
OF INFORMATION HANDLING SYSTEMS

No Field Counterpart to this HN

1. PURPOSE

This notice sets forth Agency policy regarding management responsibilities
for the acquisition of new or enhanced information handling systems
capabilities.

2. APPLICABILITY AND SCOPE

These provisions for information handling systems apply to automated or
other clearly identifiable processes used for creation, movement, use,
storage, retrieval, or dissemination of intelligence and management
information. Included are: computer hardware and software systems,
communications systems, office systems, and terminal systems. Appli-
cability of policy provisions is determined by class designation
(Class I, II, or III), which is based on system cost. Provisions are
most applicable to the larger Class I systems.

3. POLICY

a. GENERAL

Information handling systems acquisitions will be reviewed and
approved at decision milestones by appropriate management levels.
Systems of extraordinary cost, risk, or interest will be reviewed
by the Executive Committee (EXCOM), the Information Handling Systems
Architect (IHSA), and the Program Management Component who will
support the EXCOM review process. Information handling systems
falling below the EXCOM review threshold, but nevertheless important
in the context of the Agency Information Systems Architecture and
Planning, may be reviewed by the IHSA at decision milestones.

b. SPECIFIC

For purposes of management and coordination, there are three classes
of information handling systems, determined by investment cost
thresholds. Class I systems will comply with the procedures,
standards, and documentation requirements for major programs. Class
II and III systems will comply with the procedures, standards, and
documentation requirements for minor programs.

Page Denied

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Denied